

**YES,
THE BBC
IS BIASED!**

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

1 INTRODUCTION

2 THE BBC IS BIASED IN FAVOUR OF THE EU

3 NEW EVIDENCE

4 COMMENTS

5 WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT?

6 CONCLUSIONS

7 REFERENCES

8 APPENDICES

SUMMARY

This note reviews the problem of BBC bias in favour of the EU since the submission to the Review of the BBC held in 2004. It refers to two new sources which confirm that the BBC is biased in favour of the EU

Despite being found to be biased the BBC has done virtually nothing to correct its pro-EU biased output. Further evidence is provided which shows that the BBC is still propagating pro-EU propaganda and is marginalising anti-EU political parties and commentators.

It shows that there is no meaningful way that concerned and honest individuals can register their protest at the fraudulent misuse and abuse by the BBC which is illegally using their money from licence fees for illegal propaganda in favour of the EU.

It therefore concludes that the only way in which concerned licence fee payers can meaningfully register their protest at a total lack of official action to make the BBC comply with its legally binding obligations to be impartial is to stop paying their licence fee, thereby risking prosecution and a criminal record.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The submission to the BBC Review Body in 2004

This Report is a follow-up to the report “The BBC, Is it Biased?” which was produced in March 2004 and submitted to the “Your BBC, Your Say” Review of the BBC set up by Tessa Jowell, MP, Minister for Culture, Media and Sport. (Ref 1)

Needless to say the submission which made recommendations for making the BBC truly independent and impartial was totally ignored by the Review body.

Since then, the fact that the BBC *is* biased in favour of the EU has been confirmed by an “independent” committee and in a book by an ex-BBC journalist. However, no significant change in the BBC’s obligation to be impartial has been noted. More examples of BBC bias are quoted as proof of this assertion. This report also relates numerous and varied attempts by individuals to try and redress this confirmed situation, all to no avail.

It is worth reproducing below a few of the items from the earlier report “The BBC , Is it Biased?” to show that however much the problem of BBC bias is recognised and raised nothing is done about it.

1.2

QUOTE!

“The media is extremely effective The UK media approach is broadly sceptical we try in Brussels to break that cycle of scepticism. The BBC’s job is to reflect the European perspective And make news less sceptical. That is why the BBC has such a big bureau in Brussels.”

Quote from a speech allegedly made by Jonathon Chapman, BBC, “Senior World News Reporter”, (previously “Senior Europe Producer” in Brussels) in a speech to a media seminar at the Malta Press Club in March 2004.

1.3

2.3.10 Rod Liddle’s Articles

2.3.10.1 In his article in the Spectator for 10th May 2003, Rod Liddle, ex-editor BBC Today programme, discussed the setting up of the Welsh Assembly.

2.3.10.2 He pointed out that only 38% of the electorate bothered to vote in Wales which reflected the public’s lack of enthusiasm for the new Assembly. However, the BBC’s election night special presenter did her best to assure the world the reverse was true. This, despite the

fact that Plaid Cymru, the keenest party on the new Assembly, did extremely badly in the election.

2.3.10.3 Rod Liddle pointed to the “purblind political correctness” within the BBC that results in repeated assertions that the Welsh National Assembly is really adored by the people of Wales, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

2.3.10.4 Rod Liddle included the BBC’s attitude to the Scottish Parliament in the same statement.

2.3.10.5 Further on he stated the BBC’s attitude was “the result of institutionalised political correctness, every bit as corrupting as institutionalised racism. *It is the result of seminars and workshops (I remember them well) where journalists are instructed time and again that the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly are bloody important and don’t you dare suggest they aren’t.*” (Our emphasis)

2.3.10.6 These seminars and workshops did not apparently contain any instructions for the BBC’s journalists to be impartial or to treat these subjects with due accuracy. The BBC clearly instructed its journalists to use the view the BBC wished to promote. In the case of the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh National assembly *the BBC view accorded with the EU’s policy of breaking the United Kingdom up into regions which could be more effectively controlled by Brussels.*

1.4

3.2.15 Lord Skidelsky and Jean Lambert Analysis

a) In 1996 BBC bosses invited Lord Skidelsky, a leading academic and former SDP peer and Jean Lambert, Green Party activist, to analyse the Corporations political coverage.

b) The results were reported by Anthony Doran and Sean Poulter on the front page of the Daily Mail, 16th April 1996, under the headline, “You are soft on Labour, BBC told.”

c) The analysts found that corporation journalists allowed Labour politicians to get away with fudged answers and failed to press Labour spokesmen on major policy issues.

d) Lord Skidelsky, Professor of Political Economy at Warwick University, said, *“My view also was that the BBC was a power-broker and it should not pretend it was just reporting. They are selecting and creating news. They decide what’s news and then shape events partly by selecting what’s important. They didn’t like hearing that much.”* (Our emphasis.)

e) The BBC said “... but these are the opinions of only two people” which implies that the BBC were not accepting the adverse comments of the very people it had commissioned to review its political coverage.

2 NEW EVIDENCE CONFIRMING BBC PRO-EU BIAS

Since the previous report was produced in 2004 there have been two major developments which confirm the BBC's bias in favour of the EU. These are the findings of Lord Wilson's Committee, and Robin Aitkin's book "CAN WE TRUST THE BBC?"

2.1 The Wilson Committee

After decades of denying any and virtually all complaints of bias in favour of the EU the BBC was at last moved to set up an "independent" enquiry into its pro-EU bias by persistent and dogged campaigning by Lord Pearson of Rannoch and others in the House of Lords. However, this breakthrough was achieved only after many months of complaints to the BBC, and thousands of hours of costly analysis of BBC programmes by Minotaur Media Tracking (MMT) which conclusively proved BBC bias towards the EU

The Wilson Committee was chaired by Lord Wilson, a former cabinet secretary and Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge and had four members. Europhile Members were Sir Stephen Wall, Board Member of Britain in Europe and Lucy Armstrong, Chief Executive of Alchemists and Eurosceptics were Rodney Leach, Chairman of Business for Sterling and Nigel Smith, Chairman of the No-Euro Campaign 2002-2004.

According to the report in the Sunday Telegraph of 30th January 2005 the Wilson Committee report incredibly cleared the BBC of any "intentional bias" but found it guilty of "cultural bias", "ignorance" and "a reluctance to challenge pro-EU assumptions".

This was a pathetically political and ludicrous conclusion bearing in mind the quotes given above. In other words, the BBC's pro-EU bias was claimed (by the BBC) to be "unintentional", a description which defies common sense and comprehension.

For example, the reporter in the Sunday Telegraph report cited 6 cases where the BBC published stories fed to it by pro-euro propagandists, leading its news bulletins with claims that multi-national companies were threatening to leave Britain unless we joined the euro. On each occasion the companies named, including Toyota, Sony and Ford, had issued trenchant denials. Not once did the BBC publish any correction. A "reluctance to challenge pro-EU assumptions" indeed. A simple phone call to the companies concerned would have stopped these incorrect and damaging stories being broadcast in the first place. However, the BBC was so obviously keen to publish a story, any story, to promote the euro that it could not apparently be bothered to check the truth of the stories being fed to it by groups allegedly having an interest in the claims being made. A breach of the most basic professional standards of journalism. Having got them wrong, an honest and impartial organisation would have issued a correction. Not the BBC however, which must have made a deliberate decision to ignore any misunderstandings generated. An "unintentional bias", what rubbish!

Hence, the BBC has been found to be biased towards the EU by an "impartial"* committee. This means the BBC was (and is still) not complying with its legal obligations to be "impartial" and "inform" the public for which we are legally obliged to pay the licence fee each year simply for owning a TV set. This must then mean that the BBC is fraudulently misapplying the funds paid to it by the licence fee payers. This will be discussed further in chapter 3 below.

* The impartiality of some of the committee members is questioned in Robin Aitken's book. See the comments below.

2.2 "CAN WE TRUST THE BBC"

This book, "CAN WE TRUST THE BBC?" was published by Continuum in 2007. It was written by Robin Aitken, a former BBC reporter and journalist. He spent 25 years working across all levels within the corporation, from local radio to the "Today" programme. He was thus well qualified to describe the workings of the BBC.

2.2.1 The Connaught Hotel Breakfast's

Robin Aitken describes the breakfasts held in the Connaught Hotel in 1972 between the Information Research Department (IRD) of the Foreign Office and BBC and other journalists. These were charged with influencing public opinion in favour of the UK joining the EEC, clearly a gross misuse of BBC time and money in propagating pro-EEC propaganda. In addition, the BBC was also allegedly guilty of sacking news staff, such as Jack de Manio, who was deemed by the IRD to be anti-EEC.

2.2.2 BBC's Commitment to Europe

Robin Aitken stated that in the 30 years since this event (the Connaught Hotel breakfasts in 1972) the BBC has never deviated from its commitment to Europe. This has in his opinion resulted in slanted journalism, which has often disguised the deficiencies of the European project while attacking the euro-sceptic position. Negative stories about the EU are underplayed or ignored and those which show Eurosceptics in a bad light are given generous coverage.

2.2.3 BBC Failure to interview Eurosceptics

Robin Aitken went to interview Lord Shore about the EU in early 2000. Shore was eager to talk as he had been a steadfast Eurosceptic since 1970. However, Robin Aitken was astounded to find out that Lord Shore had NEVER before been interviewed by the BBC about his views on Europe. In addition he discovered later that during the European elections of 1999, in more than 250 hours of main national news coverage by the BBC, not a single Labour Eurosceptic had appeared on air. This put Lord Shore's experience in context. He had not been singled out by chance as ALL Labour Eurosceptics had been ignored. No doubt for the Wilson Committee this was very "unintentional" of the BBC!

2.2.4 Minatour Media Reports

The work by MMT was carried out over a period of 5 years and they analysed over 2000 hours of radio and television and produced 15 separate reports, all of which were sent to the BBC. The MMT reports proved beyond any doubt that the BBC was not giving the Eurosceptic case anything like a fair coverage in its programmes.

2.2.5 Setting up the Wilson Committee

The BBC ignored MMT's reports until the autumn of 2004 when a group of senior BBC news executives agreed to meet Lord Pearson. It was agreed that an independent panel under the chairmanship of Lord Wilson would examine the BBC's European coverage. The panels findings are briefly discussed above, but Robin Aitken claims that the Europhile members "***fiercely resisted all allegations of bias***" therefore a not very "impartial" or "independent" panel. (Our emphasis)

Nevertheless, the Wilson Committee HAD to admit that the BBC was biased and that *“urgent action is required to put it right”*. Unfortunately, this recommendation has not resulted in any perceivable change to the BBC’s attitude towards giving the Eurosceptic case a fair and impartial coverage which is briefly discussed in the next chapter.

3 MORE RECENT EVIDENCE OF BBC PRO-EU BIAS

3.1 FROM SEE SAW TO WAGON WHEEL

The main outcome from Tessa Jowell’s BBC Review panel was to abolish the BBC’s Board of Governors and replace it with the BBC Trust with Sir Michael Lyons as its chairman. During this period the BBC was doing a bit of navel gazing brought about by its then DG Sir Michael Grade. He set up an internal review of the BBC with the objective of “maintaining impartiality in the 21st century”, a lost cause if ever there was one! Their report was entitled “From See Saw to Wagon Wheel”. This report was produced about 3 months after the BBC Trust was formed and the BBC Trust took the grossly unwise step of adopting it as their own paper.

Unfortunately, the BBC Trust report contained two lies in the first sentence of the Introduction. This stated that *“impartiality has always (together with independence) been the BBC’s defining quality”*. Neither of which are true as even the Wilson committee had to admit.

In addition, for a report of this size on maintaining impartiality in the 21st century the virtually complete lack of any reference to the pro-EU bias determined by the Wilson committee speaks volumes by its absence. Clearly the BBC and the BBC Trust were running true to form by ignoring any reference to the EU and the BBC’s proven pro-EU bias as far as possible. This again gives the lie to the Wilson committee finding that the BBC’s pro-EU bias was “unintentional”.

There were a number of other glaringly obvious contentious points throughout the report which were pointed out to the BBC Trust chairman by one commentator. Needless to say the reply from the BBC Trust chairman was full of the usual unctuous platitudes about the BBC’s commitment to impartiality etc., none of which were true.

A copy of the letter to the BBC Trust together with a note dissecting the BBC Trust Report are attached as Appendix 1.

3.2 NIGEL FARAGE VISIT TO ROMANIA

Nigel Farage, then leader of the UKIP, visited Romania in December 2006 just before Romania became part of the EU.

The BBC sent a news team with Mr Farage and their report was broadcast on the 10:00 pm News on BBC 1 on 22nd Dec 2006. This report trivialised Mr Farage’s visit, to such an extent that a letter of complaint was sent to the BBC raising a number of issues within the programme. A copy of the letter is attached, together with the BBC’s reply and follow-up letter from the complainant as Appendix 2.

The most significant points raised were that Mr Farage was introduced as an “arch Euro-sceptic”. The use of this term was questioned In their reply the BBC incredibly claimed that this meant in the context given that Mr Farage was “extreme”.

In addition, the BBC report ended with a clip of Mr Farage entering the hotel bar in the evening. He was immediately harangued by the barman about Mr Farage's concern about uncontrolled Romanian immigration to the UK after Romania became part of the EU. (This concern has since been proved to be well justified!) Fortuitously (?) the BBC news team was already waiting in the bar with cameras and sound to record the event. The complainant questioned the feasibility of a barman in a Romanian hotel haranguing a well dressed foreign guest in this manner and suggested it had all been "set-up" for the benefit of the waiting cameras etc. For example how did the "barman" know who Mr Farage was and his opinion on Romanian immigration? This was denied by the BBC but the chances are that they were not being honest about the circumstances of this incident. Indeed, the manipulation of "vox pop" interviews by the BBC has been confirmed in the BBC Trust Report. The question therefore remains that if this was (as it most probably was) a "set-up" was BBC licence fee money being illegally used to pay the barman to act out his part?

3.3 THE NORWICH NORTH BY-ELECTION

The Norwich North bye-election was held in July 2009. The BBC local radio and TV coverage was of this event was typical in its attempt to avoid giving UKIP the air time it gave to other candidates, particularly the Green Party. The Green Party was clearly in favour with the BBC which had adopted its policy of "Global Warming" as fact. In addition, it later transpired that the BBC's pension funds were heavily invested in companies benefiting from the global warming scam.

So marked was the BBC's treatment of UKIP that even rival candidates, including the independent candidate Craig Murray and the Conservative MEP Daniel Hannan were moved to put their concerns about lack of BBC coverage for the UKIP in writing.

This then proved that the BBC was deliberately interfering in the election process, a wholly illegal activity. A letter of complaint to the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) to investigate this criminal activity was rebutted. See Appendix 3.

3.4 BBC LOANS FROM THE ECB

Ashley Mote, Independent MEP prepared a comprehensive report on ECB "soft, low interest" loans to the BBC. As the ECB is set up to make loans to organisations to "further the cause of European integration" these loans must have compromised the so called "impartiality" of the BBC. This was of course denied by the BBC.

Mr Mote submitted a lengthy file on his researches to the MPS suggesting that these loans should be investigated but, typically they refused to take any action. A copy of the correspondence is attached as Appendix 4.

3.5 BBC FRAUDULENT USE OF LICENCE FEE'S

A follow up letter to Mr Mote's was sent to the MPS referring to the new evidence (the Wilson Committee Report) which confirmed that the BBC had been biased about the EU and also to the allegations made in the same vein in Robin Aithen's book "Can We Trust the BBC?" It was pointed out to the MPS that as the BBC had been using licence fee money to produce their biased pro-EU propaganda programmes this amounted to a fraudulent mis-use of the licence fee's on a grand scale and over a long period of time, in fact, probably for over thirty years. The

BBC was on this basis Britain's longest running fraud and probably the second largest (after the EU!)

Again the MPS refused to take any action. See Appendix 5 for a copy of the correspondence.

3.6 THE LEADERS (?) TELEVISED DEBATE

In the forthcoming (2010) General Election it has been announced that there will be a series of televised debates between the "main" parties. Thus the BBC is giving air time and publicity worth £ millions to the Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat parties. This is in spite of the fact that UKIP had the second highest number of voters (to the Conservatives) in the last European election than either the Labour or the Liberal Democrat parties.

Clearly this is another case of the anti-EU voice being denied prominent air time by the BBC which, as in the Norwich bye-election, is doing its best to stifle any anti-EU case being presented to the public. This is despite the fact that the BBC continues to claim its impartiality and that it has a duty to inform the public.

It is a gross insult to the licence fee payers and the voters of this country that the BBC which keeps crowing about its "impartiality" is deliberately trying to influence the result of so-called democratic elections. One is referred back to the comment by Lord Skidelsky when he said, in 1996, that the BBC "shape events partly by selecting what's important". The Wilson committee should also take note and re-consider their farcical judgement that in effect the BBC pro-EU bias is "unintentional"!

3.7 BBC CENSORING NEWS

Examples of only some of the negative effects the EU has on the UK economy and which should be covered by the BBC to inform the public briefly listed in 5.3.

4 WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT BBC BIAS?

Bearing in mind that the BBC has been found guilty of gross pro-EU bias and furthermore that the BBC has been propagating pro-EU propaganda for well over thirty years what can the average licence fee payer do about it? The answer is NOTHING.

The efforts made to bring about a change in the BBC's modus operandi through official channels is briefly described below. Clearly every attempt at getting a result has been fruitless.

4.1 HM THE QUEEN

Numerous complaints in writing to HM the Queen that the BBC's Royal Charter was being regularly and obviously flouted and ignored have resulted in an impassive and totally un-helpful response.

4.2 Ministers

Numerous complaints in writing to the Minister responsible for broadcasting that the BBC's Royal Charter and the law were being regularly and obviously flouted and ignored have resulted in no corrective action.

Indeed, a complaint to the Ministry for Culture, the Media and Sport that the BBC was acting as a propaganda tool for the EU and should be investigated produced the incredulous response *"that the BBC could not possibly be involved in propaganda as the BBC's Royal Charter did not allow it"!*

4.3 MP's

Numerous complaints in writing to MP's, particularly the Conservative Party Shadow ministers for broadcasting that the BBC's Royal Charter was being regularly and obviously flouted and ignored have resulted in no positive corrective action. The Conservative opposition has failed to comply with its constitutional duty to hold the government to account and to scrutinise its work.

Even in debates on the BBC in the House of Commons, the Conservative opposition MP's have failed to grasp the nettle of BBC bias, even though the BBC's pronounced left wing bias is of no help to their party.

4.4 The BBC

Clearly complaints to the BBC are a total waste of time in achieving change and producing results. The BBC is generally in denial that it has any pro-EU bias and when faced with the inevitable plays it down as much as possible. Witness the almost total lack of any discussion on this subject in the BBC Trust Report which tended to belittle the findings of "independent" observers which confirmed that pro-EU bias existed.

4.5 The Metropolitan Police Service

Appeals to the Metropolitan Police Service to investigate criminal fraud and other activities by the BBC in influencing elections have drawn a complete blank, with the MPS refusing to take any action. Appendices 4/5 refer

4.6 The Norfolk Police

A letter was also sent to the Chief Constable of Norfolk, Ian McPherson complaining about BBC illegal interference in the Norwich North bye-election. The Chief Constable, Ian McPherson (taxable income 2007-8 of over £210,000) did not even have the courtesy to acknowledge receipt of the letter let alone give the writer the favour of a reply!

5 ANALYSIS

5.1 It is clear from the above that the BBC is still progressing with its pro-EU bias. Indeed, all the signs are that the EU, in the form of the ECB loans, is financing the BBC position.

5.2 It is also abundantly clear that no-one in "authority" is prepared to grasp the nettle of BBC bias and to actually try to bring about a meaningful change in the BBC approach to the EU. The problem is that approaches to MP's for example is obviously a waste of time as their objectives i.e. EU membership, is the same as the BBC's.

5.3 The BBC has a duty to “inform” the public. Where are the BBC programmes which spell out in unambiguously and in detail the EU’s negative effects on the UK and the Queens subjects (some of) which are listed below?

5.3.1 The economy.

5.3.2 EU costs of membership (currently £14 million/hour)

5.3.3 Uncontrolled immigration effects on social welfare, crime and behaviour

5.3.4 Cost of uncontrolled immigration

5.3.5 The loss of our democratic right to vote for the government of our choice

5.3.6 The loss of control of a significant proportion of our budget

5.3.7 The loss of control of our foreign policy

5.3.8 The (eventual) loss of control of our armed forces including our nuclear powered and armed submarine fleet

5.3.9 The loss of control of right to trial by jury and Habeus Corpus

5.3.10 The (eventual) loss of control of our currency

5.3.11 The loss of control of our borders

5.3.12 The loss of control of law making

5.3.13 The abolition of our counties

5.3.14 Extensive fraud and corruption in the EU wasting UK taxpayers money

5.3.15 The colossal cost of supporting millions of EU pensioners for our children, grandchildren and succeeding generations.

5.4 Clearly to expect the BBC to produce programmes on any of the above (and many more that are applicable) subjects, given its past performance over the last thirty+ years is living in cloud-cuckoo land.

5.5 It is also clear that the pro-EU bias pervades all levels of staff in the BBC and the BBC Trust. From the BBC management, news reporters to cameramen, sound recordists and clerical staff who write the lies denying that the BBC is biased. Hence no-one in the BBC can be considered to be innocent of bias.

5.6 Regrettably, it is clear from the above that although the BBC, one of the so-called great British institutions, is totally corrupt and under the control of left wing die-hard pro-EU extremists, no-one in authority from her Majesty the Queen downwards is prepared to do anything to correct it. This is a very sad reflection on the state of affairs in Britain today.

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 It is concluded that in view of the total lack of “official” effort to control the BBC’s illegal pro-EU propaganda the only recourse for disillusioned members of the licence fee paying public is for them to act individually.

6.2 The only practical action that is left to them is to stop paying their licence fee, which after all is a poll tax on their right to own a television set. Unfortunately, this leaves them open to possible prosecution and a criminal record a sad and dismal result for simply registering ones objection to a service which is not being provided as advertised.

6.3 It is further concluded that due to the perceived wide-spread bias evident at all levels in the BBC the only practical solution is to abolish it altogether. This would have the following advantages:-

a) It would at a stroke abolish the hideously expensive inflated salaries and pensions of the staff.

b) It would alleviate the need to pay the licence fee approximately £164/year (worth £410 gross on anyones income and paying at tax at the standard rate of 40%)

c) It would, at last, give the British taxpayer the freedom of choice to decide what they wish to spend their money on for entertainment and how much.

d) It would enable a new British broadcasting service to be set up, paid for on a voluntary basis which, if the recommendations in Ref 1 are adopted, will not only have to be impartial but also completely and truly independent of government interference and control.

7 REFERENCES

7.1 “The BBC, Is it Biased?” Report issued in March 2004 for the “Your BBC, Your Say” review set up by Tessa Jowell, MP Minister for Department of Culture, Media and Sport for the “Stop BBC Bias Campaign”. Authors Jerry Wraith BSc and Tony Bennett M.A.

7.2 “Can We Trust the BBC?” by Robin Aitken. Published by Continuum, The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London, SE1 7NX. ISBN 0-8264-9427-7.

8 APPENDICES

8.1 APPENDIX 1

CAN WE TRUST EITHER THE BBC, OR THE BBC TRUST ?

I refer to recent statements by both the BBC Trust and Mark Thompson, BBC Director General, on the BBC website in which you both say that “Deception in the BBC is wholly unacceptable”. The BBC Trust which is responsible for impartiality in the BBC, also say that “any breach of faith” with our audiences is also wholly unacceptable.

However, I suggest that both these statements are untrue. Deception by the BBC is clearly widely practised and even glaringly obvious examples apparently go un-punished. Therefore deception is obviously acceptable to both the BBC and the BBC Trust. I therefore believe that the BBC Trust can also be accused of deceiving the public and of a breach of faith towards the people that matter most, the licence fee paying members of the public. The reasons for claiming this are broadly set out below.

1) BBC Trust Report: “See Saw to Wagon Wheel”

Although the BBC Trust is responsible for ensuring impartiality by the BBC it approved and adopted the BBC Report “From See Saw to Wagon Wheel” which was published only about three months after the BBC Trust came into being. This 81 page report on “impartiality” in the 21st century virtually ignores one of the main criticisms of BBC bias over the last 35 years i.e. that relating to the BBC’s bias in favour of Britain’s membership of the EU.

The Wilson committee confirmed two years previously that the BBC was biased in favour of the EU, that the BBC failed to report issues on the EU that should have been reported and that “urgent action was necessary to put this right”. Despite this recommendation the BBC Trust has virtually ignored the problem of proven pro-EU bias in its Report. In addition, where the report does refer to the possibility of pro-EU bias, these references are generally qualified by the incredulous claims that the BBC came “late” to Euroscepticism or that the BBC was “ignorant” about Europe.

This is considered to be a breach of faith by the BBC Trust as it implies that any complaints of BBC pro-EU bias will not be promptly and impartially dealt with by the BBC Trust in the future. The BBC Trust has already, in effect, made its excuses about any claims of pro-EU bias in this Report. This is borne out by the BBC Trust response to Lord Pearson’s complaint in June this year that only one person in 5 interviewed on the Today programme was a Eurosceptic. Despite this statistically proven evidence of bias you replied that this complaint would be looked at “in the autumn”! This tends to confirm the view that the BBC Trust, like generations of BBC governors before it, is not going to treat complaints of pro-EU bias with the impartiality or the vigour and urgency they deserve. Indeed the evidence so far from this Report suggests that the BBC Trust will side with the BBC and dismiss any suggestion that the BBC is biased in favour of the EU.

In addition, the BBC Trust has essentially already dismissed many other areas of bias listed by Paul Dacre by claiming “But it is perfectly sustainable to compile different lists, and argue (as many do) that the BBC is hostile to” Hence it appears pointless in complaining to the BBC Trust that the BBC has been hostile to Britain’s past and British values, America, Ulster etc or that the BBC is sympathetic to Labour, European Federalism etc as the BBC Trust appears to have already dismissed any suggestion of these forms of bias in its Report. Incredulously the BBC Trust also claims that the BBC can be accused of being sympathetic to the monarchy if anyone should be foolish enough to complain about the BBC being biased towards republicanism.

Furthermore, there are a number of other questionable and/or possibly misleading statements and views throughout the Report which, having adopted the Report as its own can therefore be taken to be the views of the BBC Trust. Many of these are discussed in the addendum to this letter. No doubt, it will be argued that these quotations are taken out of context or that they are only included as part of the discussion to illustrate the immense difficulties the BBC has with impartiality. Nevertheless, the statements have been made to illustrate past experience and in many cases present a rather “rosy” view of the BBC’s past performance.

The point of highlighting them is to correct the image that the BBC Trust is trying to project. It is surely no part of a “so called” Regulators job to come out so strongly in support of the body it is supposed to be regulating! Particularly when it appears that some of the statements they make supporting the BBC are not just misleading but are untrue. Therefore, if the BBC Trust cannot justify its comments the only course left open to them is to resign en-bloc.

A number of other glaringly obvious cases of deception and/or breach of faith are also discussed in the attachment and if deception and breaches of faith are as unacceptable as claimed then ALL the staff involved in the most recent incidents listed below should be dismissed from the BBC without delay.

(NB ALL the staff involved includes all the executives, researchers, production crews, news readers etc that were involved in making and presenting the items concerned.)

2) John Redwood

All those involved with the recent BBC report on John Redwood which included the totally spurious 14 year old clip included in the report to humiliate him.

3) Graham Norton Show

All the BBC staff involved in the Graham Norton scam.

4) HM the Queen

All the BBC staff involved in the recent case of the BBC claiming HM the Queen was walking off in a “huff” from an interview. Not because of the so called “mistake” but because the BBC were apparently relishing the opportunity to show HM the Queen in a bad light. This was dis-respectful towards Her Majesty as well as to Her position as Head of State, as the so called incident besides being untrue was itself of little consequence.

5) Today Programme

All the BBC staff responsible for the Today programme for still demonstrating a marked bias towards the EU by deliberately only allowing one in five commentators on the EU to be Eurosceptics, a gross imbalance of views in favour of the EU. This bias is still occurring two years after the Wilson committee said that “urgent action” was required to “correct” the BBC’s pro-EU “mindset”.

6) “Voxpops”

The BBC Trust Report proves the suspicion that the BBC’s voxpops are unsafe and do not reflect the true picture. (This also applies to interviews!) Hence, the use of voxpops by the BBC must be banned.

7) Mark Thompson

Mr Thompson should resign for claiming that there was “no excuse for deception” whilst taking no apparent action against the BBC staff involved in the glaring examples of deception and breach of

faith listed above. He also said "I know the idea of deceiving the public would simply never occur to most people working in the BBC". I suggest that there are rather a lot of people involved in the cases of deception listed above which Mr Thompson should have been very much aware of.

In addition, there are two other examples where the BBC has demonstrated a breach of faith in its reporting and the follow-up to my complaints.

8) Nigel Farage Visit to Romania

ALL BBC personnel associated in any way with this "news" report which the BBC introduced by calling Mr Farage an "arch-Eurosceptic". They later confirmed in writing that they considered this to mean that Mr Farage was "extreme". This was NOT therefore an impartial report, added to which the BBC corrupted the film which made Mr Farage look comical.

9) BBC Information

ALL BBC personnel associated in any way with providing the BBC Information office the text for their reply to my complaints about the BBC's treatment of Mr Farage's visit to Romania.

Yours faithfully

J. G. Wraith